

USE CASE 08 / COTO PPT 139

Aftercare, defects and closed-loop improvement

Proposed operating design, version 2.0, 28 October 2026. Source concepts are from the COTO presentation; detailed controls, timelines, test gates and charging units are implementation proposals, not PPT quotations or live-service promises. All examples are synthetic. Prices and trade principal remain USD; local labour payments follow mandatory local rules. No invented partners, committed customers, tariffs or efficiency results are asserted.

Business outcome

Make after-sales concerns traceable to the correct product and agreement, with fair human review and useful feedback into design/production.

Accountable roles

A service coordinator owns each case; a qualified quality reviewer assesses evidence; the contracting seller/buyer authorize remedies; a safeguarding lead handles labour concerns through a separate confidential route.

Required information

Item/passport or lot/order reference; report date and reporter authority; issue category; observed facts versus opinion; safe permitted photographs; care/use context; warranty/claims terms; inspection results; authorized remedy and refund references; consent/retention requirements.

Separate lifecycle states

Case: received > identity-linked > evidence-needed > assessed > remedy-proposed > authorized > performed > confirmed/closed OR appealed/reopened. A suspected defect is not a confirmed defect; a request to close is not proof the remedy was delivered.

THE OPERATING WORKFLOW

From a real input to an approved outcome

01 / Open an accessible case

Responsible: Customer/retailer + coordinator

Accept a simple first-party form or agreed email/assisted route, assign a case reference and explain the next step. Collect only necessary product/contact data. A carpet does not automatically report its use; sensors or tracking must not be assumed or introduced without a real purpose and proper controls.

02 / Link the right product and contract

Responsible: Coordinator + counterparty

Check item/lot, seller/buyer, delivery date and applicable claims terms. Lost tags use a documented fallback against purchase and product evidence. Do not publish customer identity or reject a claim automatically merely because a tag is missing.

03 / Assess evidence fairly

Responsible: Quality specialist

Separate visible damage, construction issue, colour variation, care issue, delivery loss and uncertain cause. Request proportionate additional evidence or an inspection; preserve original reports and note ambiguity. A score cannot establish blame or displace statutory/contractual rights.

04 / Offer an authorized response

Responsible: Actual contracting parties

Choose clarification, care guidance, inspection, repair, replacement, agreed price adjustment or refund according to the contract/law. Specify who pays logistics, timing and what happens to returned goods. COTO coordinates records; it does not adjudicate the dispute or refund funds it never held.

05 / Confirm the remedy and payment record

Responsible: Recipient + finance reviewer

Track return custody, repair/replacement completion and recipient confirmation separately. Link a credit/refund to the original invoice and authorized route, retain reversals and prevent duplicate credits. An operator attestation remains separate from bank confirmation.

06 / Review patterns and prevention

Responsible: Quality + design/production team

Aggregate confirmed case categories by batch/design/material with privacy safeguards and exposure counts. Start with descriptive trends; apparent clusters trigger investigation. Update an approved production/design specification only after evidence review and formal version control.

CONTROLS AND IMPLEMENTATION

Make exceptions visible

Failure handling and human safeguards

Wrong/missing item match: investigate rather than invent a link. Safety issue: escalate urgently to competent parties and consider an authorized notice/recall process. Labour grievance: protect individuals and use the sourcing route. Disputed cause: keep uncertain and offer agreed independent assessment. Inactivity closes no legal rights; reopening/appeal remains recorded.

Blockchain, AI and private evidence

A case-management store with restricted contacts and linked evidence is a new feature. Optional AI can classify or summarize reports in shadow mode with confidence and source references. Defect prediction requires sufficient labelled representative outcomes and denominators; do not publish a defect rate from selected complaints. No model may reject a warranty or make a high-impact eligibility decision.

Start with the existing pilot

Use an agreed manual case register and the existing order disputed state/audit export for a relevant accepted trade. Current API has no general case portal, repair workflow, credit notes, refunds, reopened disputes or defect-prediction model.

Additional software required

Add cases, secure evidence requests, rights/claims terms, remedy approvals, returns and credit/refund accounting, escalation/reopening and controlled batch analytics. Complete the actual provider arrangement before linking any refund instruction to a payment service.

Current boundary: invited profiles, lot/order records and approvals, selected fulfilment events, invoices, operator-attested receipts, balances and protected private audit are configured. Several actions are API-only. Public blockchain worker, payments/crypto/escrow, AI, bidding, public passport resolver, evidence-vault uploads and the richer registers described here are not activated by publishing this design. Roles are proposed functions to assign and resource, not additional named team appointments.

PILOT AND COMMERCIAL VALIDATION

Prove the mechanism before scaling

Synthetic worked scenario

Use ten synthetic reports including duplicate claims, one lost tag, ambiguous care damage, a genuine batch issue and a labour concern. Verify case ownership and routing; do not display any test case as a customer review or count it as commercial traction.

Required acceptance tests

Prevent duplicate credit for the same claim; block one business from another's cases; retain an appeal; route a safeguarding concern privately; keep suspected versus confirmed defect categories separate; confirm no automatic refund or warranty rejection occurs.

Measures and go/no-go

Time to acknowledge/resolve with staffed targets agreed first; evidence completeness; reopened cases; confirmed defect rate only with an exposure denominator; repeated root cause; remedy completion verified by recipient. Track fairness and false rejection as well as speed.

Proposed payer, charging unit and cost drivers

Proposed payer: seller/manufacturer through an agreed support service, or a buyer-agreed service scope. Separate coordination fees from warranty/repair/refund liabilities. Do not charge a producer an undisclosed penalty based on an AI score.

Pilot sign-off record

Before execution, assign the actual responsible people, permitted data source, cohort/route, approved costs, test dates, evidence reviewer and release authority. Record each test outcome, unresolved exception, manual fallback and rollback procedure. Do not activate an unapproved model, payment provider, public-chain transaction or unsafe equipment connection.

Source and scope

COTO presentation slides 139. Detailed operating steps, test cases and commercial units are new implementation proposals. Read operating-model.pdf for shared controls, templates, release gates and primary technical references. The legal pack remains draft until completed and reviewed.